

MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT
CONSULTANT SERVICES DIVISION
707 NORTH CALVERT STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202

April 12, 2022

Contract No.: BCS 2022-02

Description: Survey & Engineering
Services- SBE, District 7

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST ADDENDUM NO. 3

To All Consultant Candidates:

Please be advised that the Expression of Interest delivery date for this contract has been changed from **12:00 PM (NOON) on April 19, 2022**. The Expression of Interest are now due on **April 26, 2022, by 12:00 PM (NOON)**. Expression of Interests received after the deadline will not be accepted no matter how transmitted and will be returned unopened to the Consultant.

This addendum is being issued on the Advertisement for BCS 2022-02. All prospective Consultants must acknowledge the clarifications, revisions, additions and/or deletions listed below for this Expression of Interest Addendum No. 3 by signing, dating and attaching this addendum in the front of their Expression of Interest submittal. Failure to attach this signed and dated Addendum No. 3 in the Expression of Interest submittal may result in rejection.

The attention of prospective candidates is directed to the following clarifications, revisions, additions and/or deletions to the Expression of Interest.

RED LINE REVISIONS (RLR)

Please note the following Red Line Revisions for the **Expression of Interest**:

RL01:

Part I, Section E: Key Staff. A separate Section E form should be completed for each Key Staff proposed not to exceed ~~five (5) pages~~ total. At least three (3) years of the required years of experience for each individual Key Staff shall be recent experience performed within the last three (3) years. The Consultant must document in writing in the SF 330 Section E that the Key Staff individuals meet the following requirements:

RLR1:

Part I, Section E: Key Staff. A separate Section E form should be completed for each Key Staff proposed not to exceed four (4) pages total. At least three (3) years of the required years of experience for each individual Key Staff shall be recent experience performed within the last three (3) years. The Consultant must document in writing in the SF 330 Section E that the Key Staff individuals meet the following requirements:

RLO2:

Key Staff 1: A Professional Engineer registered in the State of Maryland with expertise in a variety of highway design projects and with a minimum of ten (10) years of experience performing highway, bicycle, and pedestrian design and management of new construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation type projects employed by the Prime/JV ~~or any of the Subconsultants~~, who will serve as the Project Manager and the Primary Liaison.

RLR2:

Key Staff 1: A Professional Engineer registered in the State of Maryland with expertise in a variety of highway design projects and with a minimum of ten (10) years of experience performing highway, bicycle, and pedestrian design and management of new construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation type projects employed by the Prime/JV who will serve as the Project Manager and the Primary Liaison.

RLO3:

Section F – Example Projects: Limited to (5) example projects, each example project is limited to ~~two (1) pages~~ for a total not to exceed five (5) pages. Photos are acceptable; however, all photos count in the overall space limitations for the page and are considered illustrations and are not rated. The Example Projects set forth shall be recent experience performed within the past five (5) years. (Information provided in this section shall become part of the rating/evaluation criteria for this project).

RLR3:

Section F – Example Projects: Limited to (5) example projects, each example project is limited to one (1) page for a total not to exceed five (5) pages. Photos are acceptable; however, all photos count in the overall space limitations for the page and are considered illustrations and are not rated. The Example Projects set forth shall be recent experience performed within the past five (5) years. (Information provided in this section shall become part of the rating/evaluation criteria for this project).

RLO4:

Section F – Example Projects: Limited to (5) example projects, each example project is limited to two (1) pages for a total not to exceed five (5) pages. Photos are acceptable; however, all photos count in the overall space limitations for the page and are considered illustrations and are not rated. The Example Projects set forth shall be recent experience performed within the past ~~five (5) years~~. (Information provided in this section shall become part of the rating/evaluation criteria for this project).

RLR4:

Section F – Example Projects: Limited to (5) example projects, each example project is limited to two (1) pages for a total not to exceed five (5) pages. Photos are acceptable; however, all photos count in the overall space limitations for the page and are considered illustrations and are not rated. The Example Projects set forth shall be recent experience performed within the past seven (7) years. (Information provided in this section shall become part of the rating/evaluation criteria for this project).

CONSULTANT QUESTIONS

Q1: Since all Key Staff can be from Prime/JV or any of the Subconsultants, we request any one of these key staff to serve as the Project Manager and the Primary Liaison for this Contract

A1: See RLR2 above

Q2: Page 9 Section B.1 Part I, Section E, Page limit for this section is five (5) pages total, but there are only 4 Key Staff. Should this section be limited to 4 pages?

A2: See RLR1 above

Q3: Given that this is a survey and engineering contract, not a traffic contract, why is there a Key Staff required for a Traffic Engineer but NOT a Key Staff position being requested for a surveyor?

A3: Based on recent experience utilizing these contracts at the District, there is a higher need for the scope of work defined for Key Staff 4 (Transportation Engineer) versus survey. Survey capabilities still need to be a part of the contract, which is why it is still included in the title.

Q4: It is our understanding that this is a Survey and Engineering Contract. However, the Key Staff # 4 is a Transportation Engineer. Generally, District has separate Traffic Contract for this service and we are not sure why Transportation Engineer is included as Key Staff # 4. We respectfully request you to review the KS requirements and replace KS # 4 to "Professional Land Surveyor". Since this is a "Survey and Engineering" Contract, there should be a "Professional Land Surveyor" included as one of the KS as it was done consistently in the past for other District's Survey and Engineering Contracts. The previous SBE Survey and Engineering contract from District 6 also had Professional Land Surveyor as one of the Key Staff. The SBE teams had teaming arrangements done before EOI was out based on the previous KS requirements.

A4: Based on recent experience utilizing these contracts at the District, there is a much higher need for the scope of work defined for Key Staff 4 (Transportation Engineer) versus survey. Contracts administered by District Traffic are to primarily support Traffic staff in detailed review and analyses and are not intended for the design of traffic control devices or maintenance of traffic for construction projects.

Q5: Is a full SF 330 plus a cover letter and an additional matrix needed at this stage since the EOIs will only be rated on resumes? Is it possible to only submit certain sections of the 330 at this stage? Also, the pre-proposal dial-in # wasn't working on 3/21. Thank you!

A5: Yes, it is required at this stage

Q6: Is it possible to expand the key staff resumes to 2 pages each since that is the only section rated at this stage? This will allow us to respond more adequately to the expansive services listed.

A6: See RLR1 above

Q7: Can we use the same person for 2 Key Staff, for example Project Manager and Highway Engineer?

A7: No.

Q8: It is mentioned in page 9 of RFP that the Key Staff 1 (Professional Engineer / Project Manager) can be from the Prime or Sub-consultant, Can you confirm this?

A8: See RLR2

Q9: Who is the incumbent firm?

A9: The current A/E contracts are RK&K, WBCM, Wallace Montgomery, Brudis, Century, and KCI.

Q10: On page 11, it is mentioned "Limited to (5) example projects, each example project is limited to two (1) pages for a total not to exceed five (5) pages.", can you confirm the number of pages for each project?

A10: See RLR3

Q11. The 3rd paragraph has a sentence stating, "All firms, including Joint Ventures, must be in good standing with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation at the time of EOI submittal." Please confirm that only good standing of each individual firm of a Joint Venture is required at the time of EOI submittal.

A11: Expressions of Interest are used to determine consultant eligibility for contract award. Per COMAR 21.05.08, at contract award, consultants are required to affirm the following: "I FURTHER AFFIRM THAT: Except as validly contested, the business has paid, or has arranged for payment of, all taxes due the State of Maryland and has filed all required returns and reports with the Comptroller of the Treasury, the State Department of Assessments and Taxation, and the Maryland Department of Labor, as applicable, and will have paid all withholding taxes due the State of Maryland prior to final settlement." MDOT SHA utilizes the consultant's legal name to validate the offeror is in good standing. If the offers submit a joint venture EOI, "all firms, including Joint Ventures, must be in good standing with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation at the time of EOI submittal."

Q12: Key Staff: Please clarify if five (5) total pages or four (4) total pages of Section E is required; one (1) page for each key staff position

A12: **See RLR1 above**

Q13: Please clarify what is required to be shown on Section E Key Staff resumes, to meet the requirement of at least 3 years of the required years of experience shall be recent experience performed within the last three years. Do projects need to demonstrate experience from 2019-2022 to meet this requirement?

A13: **The resumes must confirm that the individual has the expertise needed and has performed the expertise in the required timeframe. Projects are not required but may be used.**

Q14: Please consider increasing the “recent experience performed within the last 3 years” to 5 or 7 years since many projects were not able to proceed in the last 3 years given the unusual limitations due to the Covid-19 pandemic

A14: **See RLR4 above**

Q15: Please consider increasing the “recent experience performed within the last 3 years” to 5 or 7 years since many projects were not able to proceed in the last 3 years given the unusual limitations due to the Covid-19 pandemic

A15: **See RLR4 above**

Q16: Please consider increasing the “recent experience performed within the last 3 years” to 5 or 7 years since many projects were not able to proceed in the last 3 years given the unusual limitations due to the Covid-19 pandemic

A1 **See RLR4 above**

Q17: If SHA is allowing all the Key Staff positions to come from the subconsultants, how are teams who provide all key staff from their own forces (or JV) separated in the scoring from the teams that do not

A17: **See RLR2 above**

Q18: Key Staff 2 suggests that the position can come from the subconsultants, please confirm that this is correct or incorrect.

A18: **Key Staff 2 may come from the subconsultant.**

Q19: Key Staff 1 suggests that the PM and Primary Liaison can come from the subconsultants, please clarify whether this is correct or incorrect

A19: **See RLR2 above**

Q20: Please clarify specifically where within the EOI the certification that all elements of the project's scope can be performed through its own forces and those of its subconsultants should be placed

A20: The certification that all elements of the project's scope can be performed should be placed on the Letter of Interest.

Q21: Please clarify that an individual's project examples (work conducted with a previous employer) are unacceptable as Section F Item 25 requires the Firm Name, Firm Location, and the Firm Role on a Standard SF 330.

A21: Individual project are acceptable.

Q22: We have noticed on previous EOI submittals by other firms that a statement similar to "We certify that the Key Staff meet all the requirements of the EOI". These statements have been placed in various locations in Section E, including outside the form within the margin space. Please confirm that these statements should not be made and that text outside the original forms (within the margin areas) is unacceptable

A22: MDOT SHA solicitations and details are contained within the individual procurement. Potential offerors must consider the information provided in the solicitation. Prior solicitations do not have any bearing on the solicitation at hand.

Q23: Are Example Projects going to be scored in the Technical Phase after an RCL is generated or will the projects carry only acceptable/unacceptable status forward?

A23: The projects carry acceptable/unacceptable status forward.

Q24: If Example Projects are not scored now, why are they required during the EOI?

A24: MDOT SHA reviews example projects submitted by offerors to ensure adequate examples are provided. Example projects demonstrate the offerors' ability to meet the requirements of the contract to be awarded. Each offeror will receive either an acceptable or unacceptable rating for example projects submitted. MDOT SHA will provide one total rating per EOI submission as either acceptable or unacceptable.

Q25: The RFQ states that SF 330 forms "are to be completed without any changes to the electronic format" (Section IV. Required Information, paragraph A, Note) and SF 330 form "format and spacing must not be altered" (Section IV, Paragraph B). To confirm for this proposal, can a Bidder use its own formatted version of SF 330 form as long as it meets the stated font requirements, or must a Bidder use a standard formatted version of the SF 330 form

A25: A standard formatted version of the SF 330 form is required.

Q26: Given the smaller size of the firms submitting for this proposal, would the District consider allowing the same person to be submitted for both Key Staff 1 (Project Manager) and Key Staff 2 (Highway Engineer)? As a potential modification to this

request, would the District consider eliminating the requirement for the Key Staff 2 position to be a Highway Engineer, allowing the PM to serve both roles, and then changing the Key Staff 2 position to be a Surveyor (especially since this is a Survey and Engineering contract)?

A26: Even though this is an SBE advertisement, the value of the contracts remains the same as the non-SBE advertisements. The contract value and the number of simultaneous tasks expected will have varying degrees of complexity and urgency and the firms interested in such a contract need to be able to provide staffing support the same as the non-SBE advertisements. The Key Staff must be different individuals. Based on our experience with recent contracts, survey work is minimal and Key Staff for surveys is not needed.

Q27. Given the smaller size of the firms submitting for this proposal and the potentially smaller number of projects available from newer firms (if a firm has recently started-up, for instance, they may not have a large portfolio of projects to draw from), would the District consider allowing the Project write-ups to be projects that were performed by individuals while working elsewhere, rather than the Projects be required to have been from their current firm? Given the significance of the answer to these questions on teaming arrangements would the District please consider providing responses to these two questions prior to the April 5th question deadline?

A27: Given the smaller size of the firms and potential for newer firms, projects may be utilized that were performed by individuals however that individual's role must be clearly identified.

Q28. Given the significance of the answer to these questions on teaming arrangements would the District please consider providing responses to these two questions prior to the April 5th question deadline?

A28: Yes.

Q29. Section IV, C. Financial Responsibility and Insurance, Paragraph 1 refers to a letter "setting forth evidence that the consultant has the financial capacity to provide the services and has measures of protection for the State against errors and omissions." To clarify, is this letter the same as the Letter of Interest referred to in Section IV, A. One (1) Letter of Interest, or an additional letter to be included in a separate section of the proposal?

A29: The Financial Responsibility and Insurance is an additional letter to be included in a separate section of the proposal

Q30. Section IV, C. Financial Responsibility and Insurance, Paragraph 1 refers to "evidence that the consultant has the financial capacity to provide the services...." To clarify, must the Bidder provide any evidence in addition to the assertion that it has said financial capacity? If so, what kind of evidence of financial capacity is sufficient?

- A30: The Financial Responsibility and Insurance is an additional letter to be included in a separate section of the proposal**
- Q31: Section IV., D. Special Requirements, 1. Investment Activities in Iran of the RFQ includes language referring to certification that the Bidder has not discriminated against persons/entities "on the basis of Israeli national origin, or residence or incorporation in Israel and its territories." Furthermore, the language listed on the BPW Advisory page for the Investment Activities in Iran certification does not include any language for this certification. Is there a certification form, or requirement for same, that Bidders must submit with regard to this certification?
- A31: BCS 2022-02 advertisement section III. Potential Restrictions identifies State of Maryland Executive Order 01.01.2017.25 Prohibiting Discriminatory Boycotts of Israel in State Procurement. See the executive order and the requirement for this language within state procurements. Offerors must be compliant with the state executive order to be considered for contract award. In submitting a response, the consultant is certifying their acknowledgement and adherence to this requirement.**
- Q32: Section IV, B. One (1) SF 330-, 4. Part I, Section D of the RFQ asks that Bidders prepare a Support Personnel Matrix. The horizontal axis of that Matrix can include up to three lines of text explaining each Key Staff's experience relative to the project's needs. To clarify, is the horizontal axis limited to one column, comprising up to three lines of text for each row/Key Staff member?
- A32: See the advertisement pages 8 and 9 for details on form submissions. "SF330 font must be no smaller than 10-point Times New Roman font." Section IV, B states "computer generated forms are acceptable; however, the format and spacing must not be altered." If a computer generated form allows for more than 3-lines, MDOT SHA will accept that submission as long as it follows SF 330 formatting.**
- Q33: Since SBE companies are smaller in size, would SHA consider replacing KS#2 with Prof. Land Surveyor. These are Survey and Engineering contracts and there is always a Prof. Land Surveyor as KS. It is difficult to find two high level Highway Engineers in a small firm.
- A33: Even though this is an SBE advertisement, the value of the contracts remains the same as the non-SBE advertisements. The contract value and the number of simultaneous tasks expected will have varying degrees of complexity and urgency and the firms interested in such a contract need to be able to provide staffing support the same as the non-SBE advertisements. Based on our experience with recent contracts, survey work is minimal and Key Staff for surveys is not needed.**
- Q34: Would SHA consider removing KS#3? Some other SHA solicitations for SBE were scaled down for number of KS or KS qualifications.
- A34: Even though this is a SBE advertisement the value of the contracts remains the same as the non-SBE advertisements. These are large dollar amounts and require the selected firms to manage multiple projects of varying degrees of complexity and**

urgency. We believe the number of Key staff is appropriate based on the size of the contract.

Q35: Can the project examples be from an individual or do they have to be performed by the Firm? If it is acceptable, SHA can make it mandatory that Project Examples used from an individual must be from KS individual working with that firm and not from any other support staff.

A35: Given the smaller size of the firms and potential for newer firms, projects may be utilized that were performed by individuals however that individual's role must be clearly identified. The individual experience will not be limited to Key Staff.

Q36: An SF 330 typically includes a Section G. Key Personnel Participation in Example Projects Matrix, but the RFQ does not specifically refer to Section G of the SF 330. To confirm, should Bidders provide a Section G in their submittals?

A36: Section G of the SF330 should be provided

Q37: The RFQ states that subconsultant personnel are not to be included in the EOI's Part II, General Qualifications. To confirm, Bidders do not need to include a separate Part II completed by each subconsultant?

A37: Yes, no need to include a separate part II for each subconsultant

Q38: Are Bidders allowed to include a Table of Contents in the EOI submittal?

A38: Yes

Q39: Where should Bidders include signed addenda in the EOI submittal, if applicable?

A39: The signed addendum must be included in the expression of interest in front of the transmittal letter.

Q40: Who are the incumbents, if any, on the existing contract(s)?

A40: The current A/E contracts are RK&K, WBCM, Wallace Montgomery, Brudis, Century, and KCI.

*Questions from Pre-proposal meeting held March 28th, 2022, at 2PM.

Q41. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash Hi my name is Rahul K circle with 3 years, Consulting LLC.
Uh one question I have is you said that addendum will be issued on April 5th.

A41. Oluwaseun Yerokun
Right.

Q42. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash
That is the last day when we can ask anymore questions if there are any follow up questions from the addendum how we would address that.

A42. Oluwaseun Yerokun
by the 5th would be the last day to response to questions. We will take no further questions, but we will respond to all the questions going on from today if you think of any other question before April 5th. I will issue an addendum before the end of the day by April 5th to answer all those questions.

Q43. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash
Yeah, I understand that part but there may be some follow up question based on the answers that we get in the addendum, So how would we address.

A43. Oluwaseun Yerokun
Well, right and I understand that typically we respond to all the questions if they have any follow up questions that it's really technical that is contingent upon the submission of the proposal's consideration will be given into seeing if we can do an Addendum number 2 just to make sure we clear all the technical questions. But typically, once the questions are closed, they are closed.

Q44. Steph Vander Veen
my overall question is so for the rating criteria for this one that is just being rated on the resumes and then everything else is acceptable. I'm sorry, the rest I think the projects are acceptable or unacceptable. In since we're being rated on just the resumes is all the other items necessary in this stage of the submission.

A44. Andrew Radcliffe
I believe we are just rating acceptable/unacceptable on projects and scoring Key Staff, correct?

Q45. Amado (BVF) (Guest)
For the key staff, it says there that for the project manager. There's a statement that it says it can be a prime consultant or subconsultant. Is that correct because usually when it comes to project manager? It's only the prime consultant that can?

A45. Advertisement has been revised to reflect that project manager must be from Prime/JV.

Q46. Amado (BVF) (Guest)
Uh and this is not clear in the proposal there are 4 key staff.

A46. See RLR1

Q47. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash
Uh my question is regarding the number of pages on page 9 of the solicitation for key staff, Uh it says number of pages should not exceed 5 pages.

A47. See RLR1

Q48. Amado (BVF) (Guest)
I'm sorry this is a matter again. I just recalled also that it also applies to the project sheets. I think it says there are 3 when it's that might be 5.

A48. See RLR3

Q49. Amado (BVF) (Guest)
And one more question, if I may from my end. Are there any incumbents for this kind of SBR for survey and engineering with SHA?

A49. The current A/E contracts are RK&K, WBCM, Wallace Montgomery, Brudis, Century, and KCI.

Q50. Steph Vander Veen
Yeah, hi. This is stuff with Rossi Group. I had one more question. And I'll go ahead and submit this as well. But I just wanted to clarify could we use on Individuals resumes or in the project sections could we use individual experience from save previous employers or should it all, I'm sorry for the project section, or should it all, be from the firms That they are currently working with? Can they be individual product examples as opposed to firm examples?

A50. See previous answers regarding individual project experience.

Q51. Amado (BVF) (Guest)
Will there be an attendant list that will be distributed as part of the addendum.

A51. No.

Q52. Mark Bodmann
Hi Mark Barden was CCJM there was a couple of critical questions that just got asked. I know the deadline for questions is April 5th. But I don't know if there's any possible way you could answer the 2 questions about the key staff and the projects ahead of the deadline for the other questions. Those could really have a major impact on Some of the stuff that we're All working on.

A52. Oluwaseun Yerokun
Very good and that's very good question. And I told her about that, too, so what I would ask mark is if you can just point me to those 2 questions when you when

you're submitting your questions and kind of just say exactly what you said that you know will be preferably that those answered before the deadline. I will make sure we get those out even if just those 2 first just to make sure that you know the proposed walk them.

Q53. ZEST

Just here for as you mentioned you know the meeting was postponed by one week. Uh is that possible that the duty for this proposal may be postponed as well.

A53. Oluwaseun Yerokun

Yes, and I think I just addressed that. While we are aware of that and also the management is put today into consideration. I don't want to make a statement that it's not being backed up, but again, I'm pretty much sure that will be addressed on the addendum.

Q54. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash

So, just to clarify all these submissions are going to be through Emma is that correct.

A54. Oluwaseun Yerokun

Yes.

Q55. Rahul S Kesarkar-SuYash

Proposal no no and proposal also will be submitted through Emma is that correct.

A55. Oluwaseun Yerokun

That's correct.

Q56. ZEST

Yeah, yeah. This is our new, yeah, I just want to see that this is not a question. But I just want to repeat the world heads being asked you know since this is SBE contract and usually firms may not have that much experience to show By the individually we have that kind of experience I would think it would be great and it will benefit both us and the city highway to consider the individual project experience for this evaluation.

A56. Andrew Radcliffe

That kind of goes along with the question that was asked earlier, but I will will give a formal response to it.

Q57. ZEST (Commented)

That'll be great and because you know that the fall last one district, 6 as being that it was what was done. You know it was an individual experience that was evaluated.

A57. Andrew Radcliffe

OK, that's good to know I will review the District 6 advertisement. Thank you.

Q58. ZEST

What is the BCS number for previous bid on this contract do you know?

A58. **Oluwaseun Yerokun**

No, I think somebody already asked me that for the incumbent and again. I don't know that right here. But I'm happy to respond to those questions.

Q59. Page 9, Section IV – Required Information: Paragraph B.1, Section E – The advertisement requires four (4) Key Staff and references not to exceed five (5) pages. There should only be four (4) pages for Key Staff individuals, correct?

A59. **SEE RLR1**

Q60. Page 11 - Section IV – Required Information: Paragraph 5. Section F – Example Projects – This paragraph references five (5) example projects limited to two (2) pages each, not to exceed five (5) pages. Are we to submit one (1) page per project or two (2) pages per project?

A60. **SEE RLR3**

Q61. The third paragraph of “Section I. Project Title and Description” references “Statewide Architectural and Engineering needs”. Please confirm that Architectural Services are not required for this contract.

A61. **Per COMAR, A&E services can be combined however, this particular procurement does not require Architectural services per scope of service.**

Q62. GSA SF330 for Section E.14.a, Years of experience is Arial, 8 point for example. Do we maintain the use of the font and point sizes of the form, or is it your intent that whatever text is added by firms must be Times New Roman, 10 point minimum and therefore we aren't 100% honoring the GSA's Standard SF 330 formatting in its entirety? This is with the understanding that what text is printed on the GSA SF 330 PDF form e.g. titles of sections and items, notes, etc. is to be emulated in font style and size by a Word version of the SF 330.

A62 **See the advertisement pages 8 and 9 for details on form submissions. “SF330 font must be no smaller than 10-point Times New Roman font.” Section IV, B states “computer generated forms are acceptable; however, the format and spacing must not be altered.” If a computer generated form allows for more than 3-lines, MDOT SHA will accept that submission as long as it follows SF 330 formatting.**

Q63 SF 330 Section C. If proposers use the GSA SF330 PDF format which is all that GSA offers online, then proposers are limited to the row height allowed by the PDF. Same for other sections of the PDF, for example resume Section E, Item 17 Current Professional Registration where there may be the need to show more rows to include relevant registrations. An additional Example is Section E, Item 18, Other Professional Qualifications; there may be more a proposer has to offer than what the GSA SF 330 PDF allows for in the number of rows that can be input into the PDF fixed box. Please confirm that for sections like these, using a Word computer file which replicates the SF 330 format, yet allows for more rows in a field is acceptable to use. It's given that each

proposer must weigh where they feel the most value is gained in the use of rows for fields, since using more rows in Section E Item 17 and Item 18 will use up rows that they might rather use in the length in Item 19.(3), Project Descriptions; please see Question 3.Solicitation, page 9, IV.B.1 includes “A separate Section E form should be completed for each Key Staff proposed not to exceed five (5) pages total.”

A63 See RLR3

- Q64 Since there are 5 pages allowed and only 4 Key Staff, one could assume, let’s say for the Project Manager (PM), a team may elect to have two pages for the PM. However, the GSA published SF330 PDF does not allow for varying the number of projects from five (a-e). Since the solicitation states “Computer-generated forms are acceptable; however, the format and spacing must not be altered,” does this mean that a Word file for example, as long as it maintains the integrity of the SF 330 Form style and intent, is acceptable to use when it comes to the number of projects, the vertical size of the Section E, Item 19.(3) for Project Description? Word will adjust the project description based on the amount of rows of text added and roll projects to the second page, Additionally, using Word will allow additional rows to be added for additional projects. This will allow for two pages for the PM for example, and still meet the 5 page limit you allow for Key Staff resumes.

A64 See RLR1

- Q65 Must the text, although Times New Roman, 10 point, be limited to unbolded black text consistent with the GSA SF 330, or if a proposer wishes to emphasize some words or phrases, can the text be bolded and a different color?
- A65 **See the advertisement pages 8 and 9 for details on form submissions. “SF330 font must be no smaller than 10-point Times New Roman font.” Section IV, B states “computer generated forms are acceptable; however, the format and spacing must not be altered.” If a computer-generated form allows for more than 3-lines, MDOT SHA will accept that submission as long as it follows SF 330 formatting.**

**THE SIGNED ADDENDUM MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE EXPRESSION OF
INTEREST IN FRONT OF THE TRANSMITTAL LETTER.**

Jada Wright

Jada J. Wright, Director,
Office of Procurement and
Contract Management

April 12, 2022

Date

Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addendum No. 3 for BCS 2022-02:

(Company)	(Signature-Authorized Official)	Title	Date
-----------	---------------------------------	-------	------

General questions relating to this Addendum No. 3 may be directed to OPCM@mdot.maryland.gov . The time period for questions has expired; therefore, no additional questions will be accepted or answered by MDOT SHA.